

Sibling Rivalry for the Sake of Academe  
Accuracy In Academia vs. Higher Education

An Honors Thesis (ID 499)

by

Lisa C. Hoffman

Thesis Director

Mr. Henry Nuwer, Magazine Sequence Adviser,  
Journalism Department

Ball State University

Muncie, Indiana

May 20, 1986

Graduated Spring Quarter 1986

Sp Coll  
Thesis  
10  
1989  
10  
1989  
.H64

On the face of things, Accuracy In Academia does bear a family resemblance to the academic world. A brochure describes its efforts as a "crusade to promote fairness, accuracy and balance in higher education." Its methods include using student monitors to report factual errors in lectures and texts and publishing the errors (if they are found to be such). The monthly newsletter covers all such errors left uncorrected by the professor. Its mission is to spare students from misinformation and inaccurate material taught by biased professors abusing academic freedom. Reed Irvine, AIA's founder, uses this same objective in Accuracy In Media, a watchdog organization for the press.

Nonplussed, the academy (college administrators and professors to the public), responded to AIA's birth in early July of 1985 in silence. One week later, outrage from the academy and the press flowed like a tidal wave. Labels ranged from "neo-McCarthyism" to "classroom spies" to "the purity squad." The angry waters still have not settled after 10 months. In a Richmond Times Dispatch editorial cartoon, craven university professors cower behind a desk, brandishing a wooden stool to ward off a ferocious creature: a mouse that roars. The little guy's briefcase reads, "Accuracy In Academia." Brookins, the artist,

humorously conveyed an observer's view of the stand-off between the academy and the group that wants to clean it up.

Both AIA and colleges and universities claim to be champions of academic freedom while maintaining the tradition of diverse ideas. Both sides agree that there are some professors who do not teach according to the syllabus in the course catalog and who use their position to their political advantage. They agree that something should be done. There the family mission ends and the siblings part company.

Irvine feels inaccuracy in the liberal press finds its roots in liberal education. Executive director Laslow Csorba says that AIA is a journalistic organization that prints uncorrected error and provides a forum for anyone with an opinion. There are plenty of opinions broadcast, some negative. Noted Marxian economist Samuel Bowles of the University of Massachusetts Amherst calls it, "The attempt of a politically motivated group to place informers in classrooms--not for the purpose of education, but to monitor what it deems (to be) the accuracy of the content of the course--is an invasion of academic freedom and the privacy of the classroom."

Those in higher education feel student complaints are best handled internally, through administrators, deans or department heads, not by using an outside group. Irvine replies to this argument, "We wish this were true, but evidence shows that college administrators have not adequately fulfilled their responsibilities in most cases. . . college students are consumers of an educational product. If they feel they're not getting what they paid for, it is only that they should seek help from an outside group whose goal is improving the quality of college education."

The following pages will describe Accuracy In Academia, its purpose and its methods; it will show the similarity or family mission toward academic freedom between AIA and the world of academe and the resulting clash or sibling rivalry. The conflict will be given further definition by examining the reactions of presidents of academic organizations, university administrators, professors, editorial page editors, student newspaper editors and a professor who has already been investigated by AIA.

Since AIA's inception, heated editorials in major newspapers and campus newspapers have stirred the controversy. Some professors have corrected easily identifiable mistakes; others refuse to discuss any class material because they feel no wrong has been committed. One by one, students, administrators, editorial writers and even private citizens have begun to voice their opinions. Accusations are countered by still more of the same. And so the debate continues. . .all for the sake of academe.

## Accuracy In Academia

As the youngest in the "family," AIA finds itself at the end of a long line of academic critics, none welcomed by the academy. "This is why universities are so prickly," comments history professor Anthony Edmonds of Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. "In a historical context, academe went through a horrible time due to (Joseph) McCarthy interpreting some professors as subversives and due to many who taught unpopular alternatives. There's a real sensitivity in universities to outside interference. Thirty, 80 or 100 years ago we had more threats to academic freedom. Early in the 30s and 40s, most of the problems were with Communism, not so much in the 50s."

Many liken AIA's approach to McCarthyism because its purpose sounds somewhat like the late senator's efforts to track down Communists through the House Committee for Un-American Activities in the 50s. After traveling the country and speaking about the news media, Irvine says he discovered that journalists frequently are more critical of the U.S. than of its enemies, that they show hostility toward the free enterprise system and business, and that they hold views "very much at odds with those of mainstream Americans."

Accuracy In Academia may be the newest kid on the block, but it won't have too much trouble establishing its territory. Its turf/philosophy is an extension of its big brother, Accuracy In Media.

For 16 years, AIM has played watchdog for inaccuracies or unbalanced coverage in the news. When Irvine encountered increasingly liberal views held by the press, he traced them to what he thought was the source: liberal arts education. In the August-A 1985 issue of the AIM Report, Irvine used Saul Landau, who made a documentary favoring Fidel Castro, and Bertell Ollman,

a Marxist, who has been quoted as saying, "A correct understanding of Marxism leads automatically to its acceptance," as justification for his findings. "These are some of the men who are molding the minds of our future journalists, teachers, lawyers, government officials, legislators and clergymen. Professors Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman, who are famous for their survey of the students enrolled at Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. They found the students to be even more liberal-left in their views than the media elite."

Citing unfair debates between professors and impressionable students and "indoctrination" of future influential members of society, AIM announced the "launching of a new organization to do on college campuses what AIM has been doing with the media for the past 16 years--combat the dissemination of misinformation."

To the reader it might seem that AIA has its own clear-cut political views, its own philosophy. Ironically, Csorba, AIA's executive director, feels that it has neither. "AIA has no 'philosophy.' I have a philosophy and would be glad to share it. . . (it's) really separate from AIA, because we don't take stands on, for example, certain controversial issues. We don't take stands on political candidates, that type of thing. I do. . . I was definitely interested in Accuracy In Academia because as a student I was very active in challenging professors and concerned about many professors who turn the classroom into little political theaters where they inserted material that had no relevance to the subject matter, or when they were simply acting out their political passions. So that's the reason why I'm interested and probably the reason why I was hired."

When asked for previously-cited evidence that errors in the press stem from reporter bias acquired through a liberal education, Csorba referred to public knowledge. "Well, I think it's study after study put out by the Chronicle of Higher Education and the Carnegie Institute and polls that have been conducted by Gallup and Harris all suggest the nature of the colleges, the nature of the liberal arts, the nature of the humanities...You're not going to find too many conservatives involved in academia. You will, on some campuses, and even if you do find them, they're not the activist type; they're not out there leading the marches,

the sit-ins or the teach-ins. Usually they're the ones going about their scholarly activities."

Just as there is a philosophical contrast in AIA, (one implied and one denied), there is also a vast difference between the initial and current format of the organization.

At its birth, AIA had an entirely different face. Irvine's central argument was based on the supposition that "young, impressionable" students did not have "the time or the knowledge to carry out the (monitoring) function as carefully as would be desirable." Therefore, he called on "mature" volunteers to enroll in or audit classes and lend AIA their wisdom. Adults would be less hesitant to speak up in the course of the group's evolution. Csorba remarked that they never intend to use them because AIA has enough stories and materials from students. "Today I got four or five calls. Tomorrow I'll probably get four or five calls."

In addition, there never were campus chapters or state coordinators, as promised, though there are over 150 distributors who take the monthly newsletter to campuses. The big change came in November when AIA unofficially reorganized. "Well, we don't have campus chapters, actually, it's just simply like I said earlier, we're a journalistic operation. We encourage students to get in touch with us; we don't encourage them to form chapters. This isn't something that requires a formal organization on campus. It simply requires that students be aware, essentially, that we exist as an outlet for a journalistic resource for them if they think we should publish the thing that is relevant and newsworthy to what we're trying to publish. So, many students have called and said they wanted to start up chapters. Well, we don't encourage that. Any student has the right to form an organization which is specifically concerned with academic freedom or free speech abuses or academic inaccuracy. I don't know how many of those are set up, but we're not Young Democrats or College Republicans; we don't have a formal chapter organization."

What was the AIA Report became the Campus Report, a tabloid-sized monthly featuring investigations based on student complaints, letters to the editor, advertisements for books about the conservative right, reprinted articles and subscription/membership blanks.

Csorba doesn't feel anything's missing because adult volunteers aren't being used as resources. "No. Not at all. We're journalists, and so part of our role is to call professors to find out what is going on, what is said and. . . verifying that, publishing it. So, you know I don't think there's any. . . like I said, by switching to a newspaper, writing stories and doing columns and such things. . . all that is really necessary is that we receive the material that a professor is providing in the classroom, which includes syllabus material, reading lessons, and so forth, and then we call and verify things, and verify statements, quotes and situations."

Csorba defined the purpose and the goals of the group and of the paper: "What we're trying to do is make public what is said, what is taught, so the tax payers and the alumni know a little better what's going on in academia. Hopefully, by shedding some light on some of these things, professors will realize they do have certain responsibilities. Whether they're left-wing or right-wing, it doesn't matter, they ought to try to be in balance, to be objective, as accurate as possible. And if they're not, well, they're not immune from public criticism. That's really the function of our group is to publicize these people in our newspaper."

And so, Accuracy In Academia has pulled away from Accuracy In Media, as Reed Irvine said it would. Though its offices are still in the AIM building at 1275 "K" St. NW, Washington, D.C., AIA is nearly independent of its big brother. Ironically, it has been labeled a "Big Brother" organization for its most important aspect, one that never changed. Students still report factual inaccuracies and incidents of intolerance. They still provide AIA with tape recordings, lecture notes, course outlines or reading material when they would rather not confront the professor.

"We rely on students that are regularly enrolled or registered for a class to contact us. They have every right as someone enrolled in that class to tell you or the campus paper, their parents, their fellow students or Accuracy In Academia what's going on in that public classroom.

"Students are in a difficult situation in a classroom where they differ politically with a professor. If they challenge the



professor, well, they run the risk of receiving a lower grade or some form of academic persecution. If they go ahead and challenge the professor through the proper channels, which is something we encourage them to do, namely complaining to the department chairman or the dean, usually that causes controversy and that student is made out to be a troublemaker, which doesn't look too good for that student if he or she is going to take another class in that department."

Since adult volunteers aren't used in AIA, this poses an interesting question. How will students, who know less about a subject than a professor does, be able to detect bias and inaccuracy? Having contacted AIA, students are referred to organizations and different materials so they can challenge professors.

One of the groups AIA depends on heavily itself when it investigates charges of inaccuracy is University Professors for Academic Order, a national organization. University Professors volunteers its scholars to review textbooks and answer controversial questions, though the Order has representatives from all areas of study. AIA regularly consults member historians, political scientists, sociologists and economists because it has a particular interest in these fields. Reed Irvine has said this is because they are "notoriously liberal. That's where they (students) get fed a lot of baloney and don't know it."

The UPAO was founded in 1970 in reaction to "the height of student madness sweeping campuses with the urge to dynamite the research center, burn the ROTC and kidnap the dean." Nine times an academic year it issues UNIVERSITAS, a monthly newsletter.

In its Guidelines on Academic Freedom, the UPAO defines academic freedom by the following: "The university professor, because he has mastered his subject, is entitled to responsible liberty in the presentation of the subject he teaches. However, it is improper for the professor deliberately to intrude material designed to politicize his students, particularly where that material has no direct relation to the subject he is teaching; nor has he a right to fail to present his course as officially announced."

This aids investigation, says Csorba. "Well, you know,

when you do a story, you want to find people who are experts, so-called experts in that field, get their quote, what they think about it. We've done that in many of our stories."

As a general rule, AIA seeks out cases that are matters of fact, or "clear-cut, obvious cases of inaccuracy or intolerance, whatever the case may be."

Again, Csorba is careful to describe AIA as a journalistic organization, not as a partisan, special interest group as it is often called. "Just as any journalist gets a tip or a lead on a story, we follow up. If a student calls us and says that a professor had allegedly made the statement that Stalin had killed two million people, which is something we've encountered from San Diego State, well, we know that's inaccurate--we know that's grossly inaccurate. So first of all, we need to verify that and we call the professor, and we'll interview the professor and find out if that's the truth, what he feels about the situation, whether he's aware. In that case, scholars estimate that Stalin killed anywhere from 30 to 40 million, that type of thing. As journalists, we have to make sure our material in the newspaper is accurate and precise, or else we run the risk of losing credibility, or of facing a possible lawsuit."

AIA's confidence in the accuracy of its material isn't dependent on the number of times a class is monitored. When asked what a sufficient amount of time was, Csorba replied, "Well, it doesn't matter. . .you don't have to sit through a whole term of a class to listen to a professor state something that is obviously inaccurate or wrong. Either way, we have to check up on it first. If confirmed by the professor, then we'll follow through and publish it."

AIA shows no interest in going into the classrooms themselves, noting that a journalist puts a story together by interviewing sources, taking notes and tape recordings and making sure information gathered is accurate.

Students who think they detect inaccuracy or bias in a professor's statement or in the assigned text are expected to consult the professor in or after class. If they are afraid to risk their grades, they can call Accuracy In Academia's hot line number, 1-800-334-9141. According to Csorba, proper grievance chan-

nels don't work becaus deans and chairmen "usually cite this idea that professors have academic freedom and they're somehow above criticism."

Student complaints don't comprise the whole of the group's investigations. Explains Csorba, "You have to remember that we're not just dealing with things that go on in the classroom; we're dealing with things that go on on campus, (that's why) the newspaper is called Campus Report. . .we've covered a number of issues that deal with free speech, like I've mentioned with Eleanor Smeal, Adolfo Calero, (leader of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force), and Jeannie Kirkpatrick and these people who aren't allowed to present their views on campuses. We deal with academic freedom issues, where professors are harassed because they don't fit in with a particular mindset or groupthink that exists in certain departments, (for example), this professor at Fordham University, Dr. Phyllis Zagano, who was fired because she had traditional Catholic views. She is now suing. So, we cover a wide range of issues, not just in-class activities."

Though Accuracy In Academia and the academic world get along like oil and water, their "family mission" toward academic freedom is still the tie that binds. Each is committed to maintaining freedom of expression, on that they will agree; it's each other's methods that cause disruption in academia's hallowed halls.

By having monitors in the classroom, Irvine said AIA hopes to stabilize academic freedom by promoting discussion of issues and informing administrators of teachers who are conveying incorrect information. Its brochure states, "AIA will defend academic freedom for both professors and students. It will encourage them to express their views without fear of disciplinary action being taken, either by the college administrator or in the form of retaliation against students by instructors in giving grades."

In academia, the American Association of University Professors's statement on professional ethics has its own means to maintain freedom in the classroom. A member of the faculty "may follow subsidiary interests, although these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise his freedom of inquiry." A professor "makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his evaluation of students reflects

their true merits. . .He protects their academic freedom. . .As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom."

Who will be the next champion of academic freedom? Accuracy In Academia hopes to take its place with the university professors who pledge to state the truth as they see it and with the news media who lobby for tougher freedom of information and speech laws. Maybe because they've been the acknowledged leaders for so long or because newcomers to the game have historically been censors, members of the academic world are outraged that AIA even wants to play. AIA believes it's in the same league.

Contrary to most advice, the public isn't content to let the "kids" work out their own differences. Newspaper editors, student groups and liberal and conservative groups all have wanted to participate in this academic version of sibling rivalry.

Thirteen academic organizations signed a joint statement on Accuracy In Academia last November, building a united front for higher education's offense in the heated battle of lectures and textbooks. The statement warns of a chilling effect on academic freedom, that AIA's goal is a conformity with their particular views, that it claims it can judge the correctness of what is said in the classroom. In closing, it stated, "We encourage colleges and universities to resist this assault on institutional integrity by reaffirming established practices for insuring professional responsibility and academic freedom." All the big boys on the block signed this pact, like the American Council on Education, The American Association of University Professors, the United States Student Association and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, to name a few.

Even the "Dad" of the family, Secretary of Education William J. Bennet, does not approve of the new version of "tell it the way it is." He thinks it was a "bad idea." He elaborated, "Certainly on many campuses, there is a problem of bias against conservative opinion. But the issue should not become this or that professor. This problem is best solved from within, by efforts to establish balance and diversity of opinion. It is not

resolved by seeking to mount public campaigns against individual professors."

Reed Irvine responded in a letter printed in the December Campus Report to Bennett, "If all I knew about Accuracy In Academia was what I read in some of our newspapers and had heard on some television programs, I would probably say it was a bad idea too. I hope you agree with John Silber that there is nothing about being a college professor that gives one the right to be exempt from criticism. It would seem that our objectives and methods are not too far from what you yourself have advocated or defended in the past."

In an open letter to the media about <sup>what</sup> he calls AIA myths, Irvine rebuts, "Some of the more serious errors are: Spies in the classroom--AIA has not recruited anyone to monitor professors. Nor does it send non-students to participate in classroom activities. Another is that AIA constitutes a form of "thought police"--AIA has no administrative powers. It operates like any other journalistic organization by reporting the results of its investigations. . . . No one likes to be criticized and see his errors exposed to public view. However, it is a perfectly legal activity that journalists have been carrying on for hundreds of years."

Ironically, though it seemed the public was eager to take sides in the academic sibling rivalry, only 20 people out of 92 responded to a survey on Accuracy In Academia distributed by this writer. Perhaps one month was not enough time for all parties to answer, but it is more likely that the public's attitude toward AIA is the same as the editorial cartoonist's: "Don't these intelligent professors look silly hiding from a mouse that roars?" Slight amusement followed by apathy might well be the most common reaction. Those who didn't answer the survey are represented nonetheless. Apparently AIA doesn't present itself as the New Cause of the Moment or as an ugly threat to higher education.

A sampling of those who did respond, heads of academic organizations, liberal and conservative groups, professors, student newspaper editors and major editorial page editors, gives the opinions of those who didn't mind choosing sides.

Tom Swan, President of the U.S. Student Association, didn't agree with AIA that there's a problem with students' knowledge-ability to dispute professors' statements, with their willingness to challenge the professor, or with inaccuracy in the press due to bias. "I feel that AIA is just stating these goals and 'problems' to justify their real goal--that is to limit what is being taught at our schools and by whom. The vast majority, (if at all), have ample grievance procedures for students who feel they have received an unfair grade. I also do not agree that the press is liberal."

Harold Delaney, Executive Vice President of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, didn't like the motive behind AIA's solution. "Inaccuracy of fact must always be corrected. Such correction is readily obtained by citing incontrovertible sources of correct information. Whether a point of view is expressed in a balanced fashion with opposing points of view is not a question of accuracy, but a question of professional integrity on the part of the faculty member."

The president of the Joseph R. McCarthy Educational Foundation, Thomas J. Bergen, J.D., was entirely in agreement about there being a problem in higher education. "I agree with AIA 100%. Ever since the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's betrayal of this country by handing (over) Maxim Litvinoff of Russia in November of 1933, recognition of Russian Communism in the form of the United Soviet Socialist Republic as a world power, based on the promise that they would not attempt to influence and/or establish the basis of an influence to undermine this country, they have broken every promise they made and continue to do so."

Mark Reader, a political science professor at Arizona State University and the first target of an AIA investigation, had very little to say. "No. (There are no problems in education as described above.) Remedies exist within the university for bona fide complaints. AIA has no legitimacy academically. (It) cannot judge (whether a professor's viewpoint should be balanced with opposing material.)"

'Round and 'round goes the sibling rivalry. Charges of witch-hunting and spying in the classroom are countered with accusations or propagandizing and embellishing the facts. No one would ever know they have the same family mission--fighting for academic freedom. Neither side's the winner and the students are caught in between--all for the sake of academe.

\* \* \* \* \*

The following are excerpts from a phone interview with Laslow Csorba, April 9, 1986. He discusses AIA's staff, his reaction to a controversial article written by James Ledbetter in The New Republic, the yearly budget and the organization's strategy for the future.

LH: It was puzzling to me at first with his statement, with Mr. Irvine's statement, of needing adult volunteers and their wisdom in the classroom, and after having said that, I thought it was kind of unusual that he had chosen several young men for the executive and national director's positions. That's ironic.

CSORBA: What we thought was. . .I think his thinking on the whole thing was that he. . .he's 62 years old, he has quite a bit of experience, he taught himself, Phi Beta Kappa, and he went to Oxford and he's very well-read, learned man. With my experience coming fresh off the campus dealing with this difficulty, we provide a nice balance. And I think that has worked out pretty good. We have. . .we just hired another recent college graduate<sup>who</sup> was an editor of a campus newspaper, so his journalistic talents. . .

LH: Would that be Matthew Scully?

CSORBA: No, Matthew isn't here anymore. We have another fellow whose name is Chris Alario. He was editor-in-chief of the California Review. We hired him and have another individual who has, who is 29 years old. He's been involved with student issues and various educational organizations, and. . .we do have a board of directors, which are mainly academics who are retired, some of them, and some who aren't. So, um, we have sort of a nice balance there. We have young and we have older people.

LH: At the beginning, Malcolm Lawrence was your president, and then he was replaced by John Le Boutillier. Why did Malcolm Lawrence leave?

CSORBA: Well, he's. . .Malcolm Lawrence retired and he was sort of doing this part-time. Essentially what happened, it became so much work for him. . .that, uh, he couldn't, he had a lot of other obligations and things he just wanted to, uh, I guess to pursue those and pursue something that was really a full-time job. Now John Le Boutillier came on. . .he has an office in New York and he. . .we've decided his role would mainly be speaking and helping us raise funds and things like that.

LH: That seems a little bit. . .ironic. Why wouldn't Malcolm Lawrence know or anticipate that this would turn into a full-time occupation?

CSORBA: Well. . .he did know the, I mean he knew that there was a problem. He's been involved in educational issues for quite a while. But, uh, it literally became a full-time job for him and he wasn't even paid, or he wasn't a full-time employee, he just, uh, he just had to step down. You know, I can't speak on behalf of him any further than that, other than what he's told us.

LH: How many, how big is AIA's staff? How many do they employ?

CSORBA: Well, we have, like I said, three of us, and Mr. Irvine helps quite a bit. And we also have somebody else here who works with Accuracy In Media. She's our associate editor. So, we have five or six people who are actively contributing to our newspaper.

LH: But the rest of the staff is paid, full-time?

CSORBA: Yeah.

LH: Now, I have a couple of questions about a story by a former student volunteer from Yale, whose name was James Ledbetter. And he said that you had told him that you had compiled a list of over 1,000 "radical, commie professors" over the past three years. Assuming this is true, how did you arrive at this list?

CSORBA: It's not true. We don't have to assume that. And he was never a student volunteer. He was never a part<sup>of</sup> us; he was never a member. He was a student from Yale who came here, and who posed as someone who was interested. And very deceitful, and simply created quotations without verifying them with us, and was published in The New Republic. They never called us to verify. The ironic thing is that in their story, in James Ledbetter's story, they make a point that, "We will take the word of a student without verifying it with a professor." Now here is James Ledbetter in the The New Republic publishing a story, without verifying any of the quotations with us. So they, I think they engage in their own little hypocrisy.

And, I mean, another thing is he, uh, for example, describes me as wearing top-siders and a salmon-colored polo t-shirt.



LH: You remember that well.

CSORBA: Yes, I do. Because I've been asked so many times about it. And never in my life have I ever owned a pair of top-siders or owned a salmon-colored polo shirt.

Um, you know, another thing is, he says he, he caught me watching television, um this movie, movie, planet, battle of the, Planet of the Apes, when he knows very well what I was doing was rewinding a tape, that we were on, McNeil/Lehrer, a debate, on McNeil/Lehrer, every time you rewind the tape, on comes the show that's on that day. And when you play the tape, on comes the debate. But then when you rewind it, here comes the apes. And so you have, what he tries to imply, here I am, just sitting there watching this movie, when he knows very well I was trying to show him this tape of this debate. And that's the type of thing he had done. Simply to make his point that we're not responsible, not professional and that we're some sort of group that poses a threat to academic freedom.

LH: What puzzles me is how he. . .completely got wrong what you were wearing that day, that's a little bit. . .

CSORBA: Well, um, I was wearing tennis shoes that day, and I had a t-shirt on, just a ragged, old t-shirt, and what I think he was trying to do is draw this picture of me, painting this picture of me as being some sort of conservative yuppie, preppie, or of whatever you want, polo shirt, top-siders, the whole image he was trying to create. And I imagine that's one of the reasons why they never called to verify any of these quotes. Because I think journalistic ethics, any professional journalist, would have the decency to call--in fact, The New Republic did call me to get the correct spelling of my name, but that's it.

They didn't ask questions about the article, and I wrote a letter to The New Republic, which was published, but the interesting point is they edited it. Um, the part of the letter which had said, which had. . .I had asked the question, "Why hadn't The New Republic, why hadn't The New Republic ever called me or Jim Ledbetter ever called me?" and they edited that part of the letter. Which is another indication that these people are really committed to truth and professional journalism. What they're committed to in that article is to try and smear this organization. And they did a pretty good job of it.

Unfortunately for them, I guess they thought we'd simply go away or that we would fold, but we've actually gotten stronger. We have uh. . .subscription and membership has increased, our circulation of our newspaper has quadrupled since we've started, and things are going very well. We've received support from a number of scholars recently. Thomas Soul of the Hoover Institution has done two columns; William Rusher of National Review magazine endorsed us. . .they didn't really endorse us, but they had some good things to say about our newspaper. We, uh, David Brinkley, George Will, strongly de-

fended us, a few months back. We had some, like I said, the endorsement of the University Professors for Academic Order, which is a number. . . thousands of professors on the campuses, and two Nobel Laureates and a dozen college presidents. So, things are going very well.

LH: I know that an organization this big surely needs a lot of fuel, a lot of ammunition as far as keeping it going. It's grown and grown, from what you've told me. How big is Accuracy In Academia's budget? How are the funds. . .

CSORBA: Well, our budget is \$162,000 for the first year. We've raised over \$100,000 and we haven't done a fund-raising letter.

LH: How was the hundred thousand raised?

CSORBA: It was raised, people sending, we've been in almost every major publication in the country; people simply sent in donations and tax deductible contributions. That's one source. Another source is subscription to our newspaper. We have \$100 patrons who receive books; we have book offers--for a \$25 subscription you get a free book, Poisoned Ivy, by Ben Hart. We also offer Harvard Hates America by John Le Boutillier. So this way we raise this money. We've advertisements in newspapers and magazines, and that has resulted in contributions and subscriptions. And so, without doing an actual direct-mail fund-raising letter, which we intend to do in the next few weeks, we've done pretty well.

LH: How are those funds allocated; what are they used for?

CSORBA: Well, they're used for the newspaper, they're used for salaries, they're used for office equipment, they're used for postage, telephone, travel expenses when I go speak on the campuses.

LH: Who else helps support AIA financially?

CSORBA: Well, that's essentially it. I've told you: contributors and subscribers.

LH: Have you had any conservative foundations help you out?

CSORBA: No.

LH: None?

CSORBA: No. No conservative foundations.

LH: You expressed confidence about Accuracy In Academia's future, saying that "AIA's just not going to go away." What kind of plans does it have for the future, what kind of goals?

CSORBA: Well, we plan to increase circulation of our newspaper; we plan to increase it and increase it and grow and grow and grow in terms of our influence on the campuses. We have a circulation of 16,000 now; we had a circulation of 5,000.

It will be 20,000 soon, maybe 25,000 in a couple of months. It'll grow probably each month, as subscriptions grow. We intend to have more distributors on campuses, more widely distributed on other campuses. We intend to increase our staff from five or six now, which is full-time and part-time people, to maybe 15, 20, when we move out.

LH: And you did mention moving out. . .

CSORBA: Right and we're monthly right now; we'll probably go bi-monthly, excuse me, bi-weekly, every second week. We're putting out so much material, again, that we're certainly forced to do that in the future.